



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## LUCIANEA

BY FRANCIS G. ALLINSON

SOME suggestions in the way of emendation or interpretation of perplexing passages in Lucian are here offered, with all due diffidence, in the hope that where these may not commend themselves to students of the Classics, they may call forth other modifications yielding a satisfactory text for future editors.

Chabert's recent treatise (*L'Atticisme de Lucien*, par Samuel Chabert, Paris, 1897) has reinforced the contention that Lucian was openly desirous of recalling to his readers the Classic authors, not only by direct quotation but also by allusive reminiscence in vocabulary and thought. Other things being equal, therefore, it would seem advisable to prefer a reading which implies such a 'collusion' with antiquity.

While some new emendations are proposed, it is the chief purpose of this paper to plead for a closer adherence to existing ms. readings and to attempt to show that possible interpretations of the existing text have been ignored by some of the best known editors. The following passages are taken up, for the sake of convenience, in the order in which they occur in the text. The references to Sommerbrodt, unless otherwise specified, are to his critical edition (1886-1899).

*Somnium* § 2. Sommerbrodt prefers, on the authority of Ψ, the middle διδάσκον used in the active sense. The Teubner text, it would seem, is entirely right in retaining διδάσκει not only by virtue of overwhelming ms. authority, but chiefly because there is here undeniably a reminiscence of Ar. *Clouds*, 877, ἀμέλει, δίδασκε . . . Lucian, careful Atticist that he habitually is, would hardly have committed a solecism, with the Aristophanes passage and the correct form clearly in mind.

*Somnium* § 9. τῶν ἐκ τοῦ πολλοῦ δημοῦ εἰς, ἀεὶ τὸν προῦχοντα ὑποπτήσων. Sbd. reads: . . . εἰς ἀεὶ τὸν προῦχοντα. . . . Fritzsche transposes and reads εἰς, τὸν ἀεὶ πρ.; this — supported, as it is, by the omission altogether of the article in seven of the best mss. — is tempting: cf. also Plato, *Ar.* 37, C. δουλεύοντα τῇ ἀεὶ καθισταμένη ἀρχῇ,

'the ever shifting government.' Sbd., *Ausgew. Schrift., ad loc.*, cites many passages where *ἀς δέ* is used in the sense 'für alle Zeiten, d. i. dein ganzes Leben lang.' But the meaning desired, if not required, is: 'On each and every occasion crouching down to, etc.' Moreover, the reminiscence of Aesch. *Prom.* 958 (937) *θῶπτε τὸν κρατοῦντ' ἀεί*, and 981 (960) *ὑποπτήσσων τε τοὺς νέους θεοὺς* is naturally suggested. Paley, indeed, and Wecklein (see examples *l. c.*) construe as if written *τὸν δέ κρατοῦντα* with the sense obtained by Fritzsche's actual transposition of the article. But to retain the Teub. text reading and construe *ἀεί*, standing for emphasis at the head of the clause, with both *ὑποπτήσσων* and *θεραπεύων*, is no more forced than Dem. *De Corona* (263) *λαγὼ βίον ἔζησ' δεδιὼς καὶ τρέμων καὶ δέ πληγήσεισθαι προσδοκῶν*, which Lucian probably had in mind; cf. *λαγὼ βίον ζῶν* in the next clause of the Demosthenes passage. Finally, there is a possible rhetorical balance discernible in *ἐργάτης . . . εἰς, ὑποπτήσσων . . . θεραπεύων, ζῶν . . . ἄν*; this, of course, would be destroyed by Sbd.'s reading, so far as the first clause is concerned.

*Somnium* § 16. *ἐδείκνυν αὐτῷ ἐκείνην τὴν ἱσθήτα κάμει*. Read *ἐκείνη* for *ἐκείνην*. The accusative case brings a certain confusion into the thought and probably crept in from *τὴν αὐτὴν ἱσθήτα ἐκείνην*, three lines above. Here it is not, 'that old raiment' just mentioned, but his new garb. It must be admitted, however, that the use of *ἐκείνος* in Lucian is not always as consistent as could be desired. Fritzsche, it is to be noted, omits, with Bekker, the first *ἐκείνην*.

*Somnium* § 17. Teub. reads *καίεσθαι ἢ πατρῷα οἰκία* and Sbd. modifies Dindorf's reading to *πυρκαϊὰ εἶναι ἐν τῇ πατρῷα οἰκίᾳ*. The mss. vary, but the longest reading is that of Ψ, *καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ πατρῷα οἰκίᾳ*—and four others of the best mss. give the same with the omission only of *τά*. Could we not, therefore, keep the reading of Ψ, adding, perhaps, *εἶναι* only? This would make good sense, and a mere allusion to the familiar passage in Xen. *Anab.* 3, without mentioning the fire, would be clear enough. Sbd.'s *πυρκαϊὰ*, indeed, equally with *καίεσθαι* of the Teubner text, retains the *καί* of the mss. with the additional advantage of retaining *ἐν* and dat., but both changes are violent. The ms. reading might be retained absolutely without change by construing *ὡς ἐδόκει* parenthetically, but the omission of *εἶναι* between ΑΥΤΩΙ and ΚΑΙ is not hard to account for.

*Judicium Vocalium* § 5. πασῶν δὲ ἰσχύτην ἐνόμισαν ἔχειν μοῖραν ἔνια τῶν πάντων, οἷς οὐδὲ φωνὴ πρόσσεστι.

Teub. text has ἐννέα for ἔνια. This is without ms. support, but is almost too tempting a suggestion to be rejected. It could not be assumed that Lucian would have made the strict limitation to six 'unvoiced' stops as Aristotle (*Poet.* 20) instances the 'voiced' stops γ and δ as ἄφωνα. This, however, is purely a negative argument and ἔνια has the right of way, 'quamquam,' as Sbd. *Adn. Crit.* p. xxii, says, 'vitium in ea latere videtur!' Could it be ἐννέα τινὰ for ἔνια τῶν? Be that as it may, in the next two lines some alteration is necessary. After πρόσσεστι the text is: . . . πρόσσεστι καθ' αὐτά . . . μὲν οὖν (τὰ ΨΩ) φωνήεντα φυλάσσειν ἔοικε τοὺς νόμους τούτους. Sbd. reads . . . πρόσσεστι· καθ' ἑκαστα μὲν οὖν φωνήεντα. . . . The Teubner (and Dindorf) text infers another τά from αὐτά before the μὲν and reads . . . πρόσσεστι καθ' αὐτά. τὰ μὲν οὖν φωνήεντα. . . .

I would suggest changing μὲν to ὑμῖν and reading the sentence in accordance with the context, as a direct address, i. e. . . . πρόσσεστι καθ' αὐτά. ὑμῖν οὖν, [ὦ]φωνήεντα, φυλάσσειν. . . . The ὦ is not essential but may lurk under the second τά in the two MSS. This would give in both sentences a much improved sense over that suggested by Sommerbrodt, i. e. in the first sentence: 'Those which are voiceless *per se*.' This agrees with the language of Aristotle's definition (*l. c.*) of the ἄφωνον as: τὸ μετὰ προσβολῆς, κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν οὐδεμίαν ἔχον φωνήν. Sbd.'s emendation of καθ' αὐτά into ἑκαστα would lop off part of the technical definition. In the second sentence the sense would be: 'It is befitting for you, Vowels, to guard these laws.' The direct address is almost required to keep up the general color of the speech; it would be distinctly weaker to drop into the third person here. An epanalepsis of the words used above, καὶ ὑμῖν μὲν, ὦ δικασταί, by ὑμῖν οὖν, (ὦ)φωνήεντα, is effective and thus sums up and disposes of this part of the argument. As to the dative with ἔοικε and inf., even if the example cited by L. & S. from Xen. *Anab.* 6, 5, 17 (not 6, 13), τὸ μὲν ἀπιέναι ἀπὸ πολεμίων οὐδενὶ καλῶ ἔοικε, is to be otherwise explained (see Vollbrecht *ad loc.*) yet the passage in Plato *Legg.* 879. C. — ἔοικε δὲ νέψ παντὶ ὑπὸ γέροντος πληγέντι ῥαθύμως ὀργὴν ὑποφέρειν — will sufficiently justify the construction.

*Charon* § 12. Instead of the common reading χρυσοποιῶν, which is retained even by Sommerbrodt, and which is at least forced if not pointless, read from two MSS. (A & Urb.) χρυσοποιῶν. χρυσοποιᾶ, to be sure, in its late (Byz.) use, means 'alchemy' (so, too, λιθοποιῶ and λιθοποιός in Luc., etc., mean 'petrify,' etc.), but Lucian, quite innocent of the future history of alchemy, may have been experimenting with the compound just as he uses (*Gallus*, § 6) χρυσολογίῳ contemptuously: 'stop your goldologizing,' instead of in the (later) accepted meaning, 'to gather gold.' So τραπεζοποιός, τραπεζοποιῶ, meaning 'to set out a table with meats,' not 'making tables,' may illustrate the tentative character of many compounds. The sense obtained by the proposed reading is that obviously demanded, i. e. 'the god cares but little for your gold-smithery,' rather than . . . 'for your gold-smiths.'

*Charon* § 16. Is not Sommerbrodt's emendation of κείσεται to πεσείται over-ingenious? If we are to be as literal as the Irishman's 'It was n't the fall but the stopping that hurt,' ἀποφῆγῃ κείσεται, 'he will lie there without a sound,' makes nonsense taken without the following explanatory clause; while ἀποφῆγῃ πεσείται, 'his fall will be noiseless,' is just the sense required and certainly seems like an ingenious emendation. But taking the passage as a whole, it seems possible to defend the common reading and translate: 'Even if he fall he'll lie there making (i. e. having made) never a sound, his fall scarcely heard even by those next him.'

*Charon* § 22. Sommerbrodt retains ἔπασχον in deference to the united authority of the MSS., although he had accepted previously (*Ausgew. Schrift*, 1872) the common reading ἔπασχες. Certainly this is a case where very weighty reasons would be demanded for altering the text. Yet I could not feel content to edit ἔπασχον here. It would seem probable that the scribes were misled by the conventional notion of Charon as νεκροστόλος, just as on § 24 νεκροστολῶν is wrongly translated by L. & S. (s. v.) 'ferry the dead,' being referred on general principles to Charon instead of to Hermes. So, too, on *Dial. Deor.* 24, 1, L. & S. (s. v.) wrongly refer νεκροπομπός to Charon although it clearly refers to Hermes as also in *Cataplus* 1, where it is used by Charon himself of Hermes. The whole expression in our passage seems to point unmistakably to Hermes — ἐπεὶ τοι . . . ὦ Ἑρμῇ . . . — and only two lines above κατάγοντι is used of Hermes, and ἀνελθεῖν

unmistakably refers to the ascent into the upper world. *Κατάγειν*, however, and *ἀνάγειν* could be applied to the ferrying back and forth and perhaps would not seem less appropriate, though less exact, than (*Dial. Deor.* 10, 12) *καταπεπλεύκαμεν* and its pendant (*Catapl.* 1) *ἀναπεπλευκέναι*, were it not for the context. The addition of *πιομένους* seems to point specifically to Hermes as he would conduct the souls all the way up to their libation 'licks.' Charon's boat reaches only to the hither bank. Even here, however, it could be urged that Charon was bringing them across again (*ἀνάγειν*) with a view to their going up to drink their milk and honey. For *ἀνάγω* used technically, as here of Hermes, cf. *Dial. Mort.* 23, *ἀναγαγὼν τοῦτον* (i. e. Protesilaus) *αὐθις ποιήσον νυμφίον*, and Philops. 13, *δαίμονας ἀνάγων καὶ νεκροὺς ἐώλους ἀνακαλῶν*.

*Charon* § 24. The concluding words of the *Charon* in the MSS. are : οἷά ἐστι τὰ τῶν κακοδαιμόνων ἀπθρώπων πράγματα. βασιλεῖς, πλίνθοι χρυσαῖ, ἐκατόμβαι, μάχαι. Χάρωνος δὲ οὐδὲ εἰς λόγος.

Teubner [*βασιλεῖς . . . το . . . μάχαι*]. Sommerbrodt [*πράγματα . . . μάχαι*] and infers *περὶ* from the abbreviated form of *πράγματα*, thus reading, after the [ ], *περὶ Χάρωνος δ' οὐδεὶς λόγος*.

It seems practically certain that the text should be retained intact with perhaps the substitution of 'ΕΠΙΤΥΜΒΙΟΙ for 'ΕΚΑΤΟΜΒΑΙ and accept the reading οὐδεὶς (Urb.) for οὐδὲ εἰς. Indeed, it is difficult to see why editors should have been willing to mutilate the climax of the whole dialogue. The words in brackets, except *ἐκατόμβαι*, form a swift résumé of the dialogue, and are necessary as a contrast to the closing clause,—it is an analysis, namely, of the affairs of mortals : 'Kings, golden ingots, etc., but never a word about Charon!' As Sommerbrodt edits, where is the point of the contrast? The ingenious transformation of *πράγματα* into *περὶ* is at first sight alluring. The Aristophanes passage, *Ranæ* 87, *περὶ ἐμοῦ δ' οὐδεὶς λόγος*, of course, suggested Lucian's closing words, but this quotation, like many others, settled, perhaps, inexactly in Lucian's memory. At any rate, the omission of *περὶ* seems to have commended itself to him when using the phrase; cf. *Catapl.* § 14. *εἰπέ μοι, ὦ Κληθοῖ, ἐμοῦ δὲ οὐδεὶς ὑμῖν λόγος*; and again *Fugit.* § 28, *ὁ Κάνθαρος φιλοσοφεῖ, φησὶν, ἡμῶν δὲ οὐδεὶς λόγος*. This point, then,—and it is the only one that is alluring in Sbdt.'s reading,—may be considered as eliminated. Fritzsche,

perceiving that the words form an integral part of the thought, reads: . . . πράγματα, βασιλῆως πλίνθοι χρυσαὶ ἱκατόμβαι Χάρωνος δὲ οὐδὲις λόγος. Since ἱκατόμβαι, as such, have not been discussed in the dialogue, Fritzsche attempts to explain the word as an equivalent of ἀναθήματα. He cites Hdt. 4, 179 (apparently ignoring the idiom of ἄλλος in the sense of 'besides') and Hdt. 1, 90, where his argument that ἀναθήματα might be used as a general term including ἱκατόμβαι, certainly does not prove the converse of the proposition. 'Hemsterhusius,' he adds, 'voce ἱκατόμβαι, pro qua Solanus τύμβοι expectarat, vel maxime offensus est.' Taking the suggestion of 'τύμβοι' I propose ἐπιτύμβιοι (sc. χοαί) in place of ἱκατόμβαι. The changes in the letters would be insignificant, and the substitution of the more familiar word would be a change easily imagined. With this substitution we should then have a consistent summary of the main content of the previous dialogue including, by means of ἐπιτύμβιοι, §§ 22, 23, which contain the allusions of prime professional interest to Charon; μάχαι should come next, as it does, in order to refer to the affair between the Argives and Spartans (§ 24). Fritzsche's omission of μάχαι is the more remarkable, as he retains, in some form, the rest of the words. The dialogue—one of the most perfectly constructed of Lucian's works—would thus be carried out in careful detail and conclude appropriately to its matter and its manner: 'Lord, what fools these mortals be! Kings, golden ingots, funeral libations, battles—but never a word of Charon!'

*Vitarum Auctio* § 14. Buyer: τί γὰρ ὁ αἰὼν ἐστί; Heraclitus: παῖς παίζων, πεσσευών, διαφερόμενος (suprascr. συμφερόμενος Ψ.). Sommerbrodt emends the last word to συνεκφερόμενος and translates 'Ein Kind das scherzt, spielt, und mit den andern zu Grabe getragen wird.' It does not seem likely that Lucian has so much in mind the closing by death of the child's brief hour of play as some idea more characteristic of Heraclitus, e.g. that human life is the plaything of the current—one of τῶν ρεόντων. Either one of the mss. readings διαφερόμενος, 'tossed about,' or συμφερόμενος, 'borne along (with the current)', would satisfy this interpretation. But some term continuing the figure of playing at draughts would best satisfy the context. The simple verb φέρω is used of moving the pieces Plato *Rep.* 487 B. and cf. Legg. 739 ἡ φορά. Could διαφερόμενος mean 'and (himself) moved about like a piece on the board?' Lucian's direct quotation from Heraclitus

apparently stops with *πεσσεύων*, cf. *Frag.* 79 (Fairbanks, p. 42) *αὐὸν παῖς ἐστὶ παῖζων, πεσσεύων· παιδὸς ἢ βασιλῆϊ.* This latter clause in the original (for which the doubtful word in Lucian is substituted), gives perhaps negative help as it simply returns to the idea of *παῖζων*, thus giving no support to Sommerbrodt's emendation and translation so far as this part of the fragment can be supposed to continue the same sentence. Therefore, both as accounting for the various readings, and also for the sake of the meaning, I should suggest writing *συνδιαφερόμενος* (combined from the mss. and also in the Scholia; see Reitz, *ad loc.*). The double compound would have been not unlikely to be abbreviated to one of the shorter compounds. It is used once by Lucian (*Hist. Conscrib.* § 45) in the meaning here desired and not in the sense of 'fighting' (which, following Du Soul, is the meaning assigned to the Scholium even in Steph. Lex. s. v. 'Med. signif. Pugnandi in var. scrip. ap. Luc. Vit. Auct. ap. Solanum ad Schol.). I should then suggest translating the double compound: 'Moved about along with (the rest of the checkers).'

While speaking of the *Vitarum Auctio*, the divergences of translators in two passages may be noticed. Does not *φορή* (§ 4) mean 'rotation'? If Lucian can, as he does, attribute to Pythagoras the four 'elements' defined by Empedocles, their interchanging motion would come 'mit im Kauf' (cf. also below, § 13, *ἀτόμων φορή* of Democritus). Pauly renders by the somewhat comprehensive term 'Kräfte,' while Miss E. J. Smith, in her racy translation of Selections from Lucian, renders it 'mass'; a rendering which decides for the view, perhaps possible, that it is the *form* not the '*mode of motion*,' to which Pythagoras is alluding. The latter translator also renders (§ 11) — and this seems less defensible — *τραπεζίτης* as 'cabinet-maker.' Is not the orthodox meaning intelligible enough? 'Be you currier, or pickler, or carpenter, or *cashier*, there'll be nothing to hinder, etc.'

*Vera Historia* B, § 1. Two changes made by Sbdt. in this section will serve to indicate the tendency to emend freely, against ms. tradition, to which even so ripe a scholar as Sommerbrodt occasionally succumbs.

(a) καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν διορύξαι κατὰ τὸν δεξιὸν τοῖχον ἀποδρᾶναι, καὶ ἀρξάμενοι διεκόπτομεν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ . . . Sbdt. changes to *διακόπτειν* and begins a new sentence after *ἀποδρᾶναι*, omitting the *δέ*



after *ἐπειδή*, and reading, καὶ ἀρξάμενοι διακόπτειν, ἐπειδὴ προελθόντες . . . This makes very good syntax and is, as he says, less abrupt. But it leaves no contrasting clause for the *μέν* above and also ignores the apparently intentional repetition in the similar phraseology, three lines below, ἀρξάμενοι οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν οὐραίων ἐκαίομεν. In fact, even if we had the choice presented on MS. authority, the *textus receptus* would be preferable.

(δ) In this same section there is a difficulty of a different kind — this time a variation in the MSS. between two improbable forms. The sea-monster is described as in process of mortification on the tenth and eleventh days, δεκάτῃ δὲ καὶ ἑνδεκάτῃ τέλειον ἀπενεκροῦτο (v. l. ἀπονενέκρωτο, ἀπονενεκροῦτο), and on the thirteenth day his actual death took place ἤδη ἐτεθνήκει. The imperfect ἀπενεκροῦτο, if supported by MS. authority (Sbdt. in reporting the MSS. here contradicts himself), would give the requisite sense, though τέλειον seems somewhat forced, and the subsequent statement of his death seems to exclude the plpf. Is it possible that Lucian here tried his hand at another double compound? (see the long list p. 124 ff., Chabert *L'Atticisme*). ἐννεκρόομαι was used by Plutarch and the imperfect of ἀπεννεκρόομαι, i. e. — ἀπεννεκροῦτο would have given ample opportunity for variants. Translate: 'Internal (ἐν +) mortification was (at last? τέλειον, see Steph. s. v.) setting in (or, completely? τέλειον) from mouth to tail (ἀπο +), and he was malodorous.' If τέλειον means 'completely' and if the plpf. stands, the phrase would mean 'complete mortification had set in'; 'he was as dead as a door-nail.' This is manifestly inconsistent with the statement of his subsequent death.

*De Morte Peregrini* § 3. διὰ τοῦ γυμνασίου αὐτῶν ἐπήκουον. As the sense was incomplete, αὐτῶν was emended by Schaefer to ἀλύων and this, written ἀλύων, is accepted in Teubner ed. Sommerbrodt's emendation (*Lucianea*, p. 126) of this somewhat inappropriate word (meaning 'wildly roaming'), into ἀνιών is far better, but Levi<sup>1</sup> rejects this on the ground that ἀνιών must mean either 'going up,' or 'returning.' This meaning of 'going up' may be as suitable here (cf. Frazer's *Pausanias*, Vol. IV, pp. 101-2) as of coming up from the Piraeus in Plato's *Rep.* 439 E, but I would suggest, as an alternative for ἀνιών,

<sup>1</sup> Critical ed. of *Peregrinus*, by Lionello Levi, Berolini apud Weidmannos, 1892.

the compound ΔΙΩΝ, conforming nearly as well to the space and letters of ΑΥΤΩΝ. Lucian, having in mind the market-place scene in the *Acharnians* (845) *χλαῖναν δ' ἔχων φωνὴν διαί*, would not consider *διὰ τοῦ γυμνασίου διῶν* an unnatural expression.

*De Morte Peregrini* § 11. *ὅτι καινὴν ταύτην (v. l. ταῦτα) τελετὴν εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸν βίον.* Levi would emend *ταύτην* to *ἐνταῦθα*, saying of *ταύτην*, '*haud facile feras cum antea de τελετῇ περὶ αὐτῶν verba facta sint.*' Would not *ταύτη* be easier, meaning 'in this way,' i. e. by the death on the cross?

*De Morte Peregrini* § 25. *οὐκ ἀπ' ἐλπίδος μὴ ἀναπηδήσεσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμίφλεκτον, εἰ μὴ, . . . τὴν πυράν.*

Fritzsche's emendation may safely be ignored as wanton tampering with the text, except, perhaps, the change of *οὐκ* to *οὐδ'*. Three elements of uncertainty exist as to the meaning: (a) Is *ἐλπίς* to be referred to the speaker's outlook or to Peregrinus's mental state? The latter is Pauly's interpretation: 'Sonst bliebe ihm immer noch die Hoffnung.' (b) Is *ἐλπίς* used meaning 'hope' or merely 'expectation?' (c) Is the negative *μὴ* with the infin. the otiose *μὴ* repeating the negative idea of the leading sentence (*G. M. T.* § 815), and would Lucian have written *μὴ οὐ* had he intended the infinitive clause to be negative?

As to (a) it seems less natural to refer the thought with Pauly to Peregrinus than with Bernays ('Man braucht auch die Hoffnung nicht aufzugeben,') to the speaker or to the general public. The second (b) and the third (c) mutually exclude each other.

If *μὴ* has here a real negative force I should suggest solving the difficulty by putting an interrogation mark at the end of the whole sentence. We should then have the sense desired, instead of its opposite (as is the case in Bernays's translation), and could translate: 'Is it not beyond hope that he will not jump out?' (i. e. is it not too good to hope for that he'll stay and be burnt?) If, however, it is assumed that Lucian would have written *μὴ οὐ* to express the dependent negative, we are apparently thrown upon the less natural meaning of *οὐκ ἀπ' ἐλπίδος*, but the passage would be translated as it stands without interrogation: i. e. 'It is not past belief that he'll jump out, etc.' Bernays's translation, implying a hope that he will jump out, could be justified by the somewhat far-fetched interpretation that the speaker

implies a willingness to see Peregrinus saved alive rather than have this martyrdom completed for the Cynics to brag of. The honest, impulsive wish to see him burnt up once for all suits better the temper of the speaker. The phrase ἀπ' ἐλπίδος, which Fritzsche edits out, occurs Ap. Rh. 2, 863, μάλα πολλὸν ἀπ' ἐλπίδος ἔπλετο.

*De Morte Peregrini* § 43. ὡς ἐπιταραχθείη μὲν τῆς νυκτὸς ἐν μέσῳ τῷ ἀγῶνι (vulgo Αἰγαίῳ) γνόφου καταβάντος καὶ κῶμα παμμέγεθες ἐγείραντος ἐκώκυε μετὰ τῶν γυναικῶν . . .

The passage is much confused, but Levi has shown from the united testimony of the mss. that the correct reading is ἀγῶνι for Αἰγαίῳ hitherto accepted. This necessarily carries with it the rejection of Fritzsche's plural ἐπιταραχθείμεν and leaves us with the μὲν to account for. Next comes the difficulty, to which Professor Gildersleeve has called my attention, in γνόφου . . . ἐγείραντος. The 'darkness' could not, strictly speaking, kick up a big sea; and we should expect, — as in *Charon*, § 7, χεიმὼν ἄφνω καὶ γνόφος ἐμπεσὼν . . . περιέτρεψεν ἡμῖν τὴν νῦν —, some addition like χεიმῶνος καὶ (possibly lost after ἀγῶνι), or πνεύματος (possibly dropped out before κῶμα or after ἐγείραντος), but it is possible that γνόφος may have been loosely used for 'a cloud burst.' However that may be, the main difficulty still remains and editors (Fritzsche — Levi) have usually assumed a lacuna before ἐκώκυε. The Teubner text has ἐπιταραχθεῖς μὲν, etc., without lacuna and without any contrast to μὲν. The change to the imperfect, in the face of the two optatives συμπλεύσοιμι and ἐπιταραχθείη above, is difficult, and, were it not for the μὲν, Fritzsche's suggestion of ὅτε περ (borrowed from *Charon*, l. c.) with the imperfect, would seem like a possible explanation. It has occurred to me that possibly after ἐγείραντος, ΑΥΤΟΣΔ' might have dropped out and, going one step further, change ἐκώκυε to (δ)ὲ κωκύοι and translate αὐτὸς δὲ κωκύοι 'while he himself began his womanish wailings with the best of them.' This contrast is awkward; we should rather expect κωκύοι δέ unless, perhaps, αὐτός (= 'the master') is viciously emphasized to distinguish him from his companion.

Till some more satisfactory solution is offered the passage might be printed ἐπιταραχθείη μὲν etc., . . . ἀγῶνι etc., . . . ἐγείραντος, ἐκώκυε (\*δὲ) μετὰ etc., . . . without any lacuna.